

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

ARZEL L. FOSTER III,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 07-CV-11250

v.

JUDGE PAUL D. BORMAN
MAGISTRATE JUDGE PAUL J. KOMIVES

AMERIQUEST MORTGAGE et. al.,

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the Court is plaintiff Arzel L. Foster III's ("Plaintiff") "MOTION TO RECONSIDERATION IN REINSTATING MY MOTION AND COMPLETE CASE ON AMENDED COMPLAINT FIRST PARTY JOINDER EVIDENT OF ALL DISCOVERY" filed on March 31, 2009. (Dkt. No. 57).

Although Plaintiff's motion is not titled as a motion for reconsideration and does not specifically mention the Court's March 11, 2009 Opinion and Order Denying Plaintiff's Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation against Default Judgment (Dkt. No. 56), the Court will treat it as a motion for reconsideration of the Court's March 11, 2009 Opinion and Order because it addresses alleged rules of law pertaining to default judgments.

According to Local Rule 7.1(g)(3), a motion for rehearing or reconsideration must be filed within ten days after the entry of the decision to which it objects. Here, because Plaintiff filed his Motion twenty days after the Court filed its March 11, 2009 Opinion and Order, Plaintiff's Motion

is untimely.¹

Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration.

SO ORDERED.

s/Paul D. Borman
PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: April 17, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served on the attorneys of record by electronic means or U.S. Mail on April 17, 2009.

s/Denise Goodine
Case Manager

¹ Even if the Court were to excuse Plaintiff's error, Plaintiff's motion is without merit, as it does not "demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled," as is required under Local Rule 7.1(g).